



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,332	04/06/2001	Michael Kelbaugh	723-1081	6939
27562	7590	05/28/2008		
NIXON & VANDERHYE, P.C.			EXAMINER	
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			RAMPURIA, SATISH	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/28/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
09/827,332	KELBAUGH ET AL.	
<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
SATISH S. RAMPURIA	2191	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-10,12-21,23-31,33-50,52-61,63-71 and 73-85.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Wei Zhen/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2191

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicants arguments that neither Othmer nor Wygodny fails to teach making decisions based on a user's role, and varying the contents of a menu, based on the user's role. It is noted that the rejection clearly points out where Othmer and Wygodny teach the claimed features and why it would have been obvious to combine their teachings. Othmer discloses monitoring the operations of computer based systems connected to a server (see the summary), specifically Othmer disclose the server uses the user ID to associate static information (i.e., based on user's role) with a particular client machine (col. 13, lines 48-64). And Wygodny discloses in a remote mode developer uses the program called the BugTrapper analyzer to create (customized) a trace file. The analyzer obtains information about the client at the compile time for the specific client (col. 5, lines 25-53) and the TCI file is defined (i.e., customized) for a specific client (col. 10, lines 62-67), which is customized based on a user's (client's) needs or role. Also, as understood from the Applicants specification and drawings that menu is the information displayed to the user depending on their role i.e., tester, developer, or project coordinator etc. (Specification, page 14). Wygodny explicitly discloses menu is displayed to user (in this case the menu is for developer) to select the execution files col. 11, lines 12-23 "To use the online mode to trace an executable 314 that is not currently running, the developer selects an executable file to run as the client 102. To run an executable file, the developer 112 double-clicks the <New Executable> text 365 in the executable pane 314 to open a file selection window thus allowing the developer 112 to select the required executable. Alternatively, the developer 112 can click the Run button on the toolbar 306, or select the Run option from the "Executable" menu after selecting the <New Executable> text. The file selection window provides a command line arguments text box to allow the developer 112 to specify command line arguments for the selected executable file") and (col. 12, lines 3-21 "The developer can also add an executable file (e.g. a windows .exe file) to the executable pane 314 without actually running the executable file. To add an executable that is not currently running (and which is not to be run yet) to the executable pane 314, the developer 112 selects the <New Executable> text 365 and then clicks the Add button on the toolbar 306, whereupon a file selection window is displayed. The developer 112 uses the file selection window to select the desired executable and closes the file selection window. The file selection window provides a text field to allow the developer to enter command line arguments for the executable. Upon closing the file selection window, the trace options window 500 is displayed which enables the developer 112 to select the functions to trace. After selecting trace options and closing the trace options window, the selected executable is inserted into the Executable pane 314 with the status "Inactive." The developer can then begin a trace on the inactive executable by selecting the executable in the executable pane 314 and clicking the "Run" or "Attach" buttons on the toolbar 306"). Rather, in response to Applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Therefore, the rejection is proper and maintained herein.